arXiv:1412.2777v3 [astro-ph.CO] 16 Jan 2016

New evidence for interacting dark energy from BOSS

Elisa G. M. Ferreira,[1,*] Jerome Quintin,[1,†] André A. Costa,[2,‡] E. Abdalla,[2,§] and Bin Wang[3,¶]

[1]*Department of Physics, McGill University, Montréal, QC, H3A 2T8, Canada*
[2]*Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo, C.P. 66318, 05315-970, São Paulo, SP, Brazil*
[3]*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, 200240 Shanghai, China*

(Dated: January 19, 2016)

In this paper, we show that an interaction between dark matter and dark energy is in better agreement with the most recent large scale structure observations than the standard ΛCDM scenario. The result presented by the BOSS-SDSS collaboration measuring the baryon acoustic oscillations of the Ly-α forest from high-redshift quasars indicates a 2.5σ departure from the standard ΛCDM model. This is the first time that the evolution of dark energy at high redshifts has been measured, and the current results cannot be explained by simple generalizations of the cosmological constant. We show here that a simple phenomenological interaction in the dark sector provides a good explanation for this deviation, naturally accommodating the Hubble parameter obtained by BOSS, $H(z = 2.34) = 222 \pm 7$ km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1}. By performing a global fit of the parameters with the inclusion of this new data set together with the *Planck* data for the interacting model, we are able to show that some interacting models have constraints for $H(2.34)$ and $D_A(2.34)$ that are compatible with the ones obtained by the BOSS collaboration, showing a better concordance than ΛCDM. A small positive coupling constant is obtained for those models, which also helps alleviating the coincidence problem.

PACS numbers: 98.80.-k, 95.36.+x, 98.80.Es, 95.30.Sf, 98.80.Jk

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the biggest challenges in cosmology and astrophysics nowadays is to understand the nature of the two most abundant components of the universe: dark energy and dark matter. These are usually described as two independent components where dark matter is responsible for most of the non-relativistic matter in the universe and where dark energy is responsible for the late time acceleration of our universe, which is described by a cosmological constant in the Λ-cold-dark-matter (ΛCDM) model. This standard model is widely used to describe the cosmological evolution of the universe [1], and it fits very well the current observational data. However, this model has some theoretical and observational challenges (see, e.g., [2]) that open the way for alternative models of dark energy.

Recently the Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey (BOSS) experiment of the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) collaboration presented new evidence against the ΛCDM model [3] based on the measurements of the baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) flux-correlation function of the Lyman alpha (Ly-α) forest from 158,401 quasars at high redshifts ($2.1 \leq z \leq 3.5$). Comparatively to previous experiments, they provide the line of sight and tangential BAO components, and this allows one to determine the angular distance and the Hubble distance independently. Their results indicate a deviation from ΛCDM of the Hubble parameter and of angular distance at an average redshift of 2.34 (1.8σ and 1.6σ deviations from *Planck*+WMAP and ACT/SPT respectively). Assuming a ΛCDM universe, this implies a negative energy density for the dark energy component, $\frac{\rho_{DE}(z=2.34)}{\rho_{DE}(0)} = -1.2 \pm 0.8$, which is 2.5σ away from the expected value. We point out that BOSS is not optimized to observe quasars at such high redshifts. However, if more data or other experiments show that this discrepancy stands, then it would indicate that ΛCDM needs to be revised. Its simplest generalization would consist in allowing for dynamical dark energy (see [4] for a review), but this would not be enough to fix this discrepancy. In dynamical dark energy models, all matter contents are individually conserved, and so, agreeing with the BOSS result for $H(z = 2.34)$ would require a negative energy density for dark energy [3]. This may lead one to study very exotic forms of dark energy.

A simpler solution is to consider interacting dark energy. Indeed, dark energy could couple to gravity, neutrinos, or dark matter since its effects have only been detected gravitationally. Interaction with baryonic matter (or radiation) has very tight constraints from observations [5] and must be very small or negligible. In this sense, we are interested in models in which dark energy interacts with the dark matter component. In a field theory description of those components, this interaction is allowed and even mandatory [6, 7]. However, the main motivation to introduce such an interaction is to alleviate the coincidence problem, which can be done given an appropriate interaction.

Since the nature of the dark sector is unknown, the study of these coupled dark energy models is challeng-

*Electronic address: elisa.ferreira@mail.mcgill.ca
†Electronic address: jquintin@physics.mcgill.ca
‡Electronic address: alencar@if.usp.br
§Electronic address: eabdalla@usp.br
¶Electronic address: wang_b@sjtu.edu.cn

ing. Many different models of this interaction have been studied in the literature from the point of view of either interacting field theory or phenomenology (for a classification of those models, see [8]). As an example of phenomenological study, one can consider holographic dark energy or a quintessence field interacting with a dark matter fluid [9–13]. There are also attempts to develop Lagrangian models where one postulates an interaction between the scalar field, playing the role of dark energy, and a fermionic field, playing the role of dark matter [6, 14–16] (see, however, [17]).

Recently, there have been studies of interacting dark energy models in light of new observations [18]. However, we note that there has been only little exploration of the consequences of the results from BOSS in the literature [19–21], and these studies do not explore the idea of interacting dark energy and dark matter. Thus, it would be interesting to see what are the phenomenological implications from BOSS for interacting dark energy. Since this model allows for one of the components to decay into the other, we claim that energy flow from dark energy to dark matter implies a smaller amount of dark matter in the past, thus accommodating for the value of the Hubble parameter at $z = 2.34$ found by BOSS and still maintaining the cosmology today close to ΛCDM. As a first test, we perform a comparison by showing that the observational value of the Hubble parameter from quasars given by the BOSS collaboration, $H(2.34) = 222 \pm 7$ km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1}, is consistent with the interacting model with a small positive coupling constant. This comparison serves to indicate that the interaction is able to accommodate the BOSS collaboration result. After that, we perform a full Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) analysis using the new BOSS data together with the *Planck* data for the interacting model. We show that the constraints on $H(z = 2.34)$ and $D_A(z = 2.34)$ for the interacting model are in better agreement with BOSS compared to ΛCDM.

II. THE MODEL

A. Theoretical Setup

Given the energy conservation of the full energy-momentum tensor, we can suppose that the fluid equations representing dark energy (DE) and dark matter (DM) are not conserved separately. In a Friedmann-Robertson-Walker universe, we take

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\rho}_{DM} + 3H\rho_{DM} &= Q_{DM} = +Q\,, \\ \dot{\rho}_{DE} + 3H\left(1+\omega_{DE}\right)\rho_{DE} &= Q_{DE} = -Q\,, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

and all other components follow the standard conservation equations. In the above equations, ρ_{DM} and ρ_{DE} are the energy densities for dark matter and dark energy, respectively; $\omega_{DE} = p_{DE}/\rho_{DE}$ is the equation of state (EoS) of dark energy, considered constant in this work; and Q indicates the interaction between dark energy and dark matter. One can take the Taylor expansion of the general interaction term $Q(\rho_{DM}, \rho_{DE})$, and thus, it can be represented phenomenologically as $Q \simeq 3H(\xi_1\rho_{DM} + \xi_2\rho_{DE})$, where the coefficients ξ_1 and ξ_2 are to be determined by observations [13, 23]. Following our definition, if $Q > 0$, then dark energy decays into dark matter, and for $Q < 0$, the energy flow is in the opposite direction. The first case is consistent with the requirement that the energy density for dark energy must be of the same order as the one for dark matter for a longer period of time in order to alleviate the coincidence problem.

The validity of the phenomenological interacting dark energy model was studied in [11] where it was found that the curvature perturbation can always be stable when the interaction is proportional to the energy density of dark energy, i.e. where $\xi_1 = 0$ while $\xi_2 \neq 0$. This is true for the constant equation of state within the range $-1 < \omega_{DE} < 0$ (we call this Model I) and for $\omega_{DE} < -1$ (Model II). For the interaction proportional to the dark matter energy density ($\xi_1 \neq 0$ while $\xi_2 = 0$), the curvature perturbation is only stable when the constant ω_{DE} is smaller than -1, which we call Model III. The models are summarized in Table I.

TABLE I: Interacting dark energy models considered in this paper.

Model	Q	DE EoS
I	$3\xi_2 H\rho_{DE}$	$-1 < \omega < 0$
II	$3\xi_2 H\rho_{DE}$	$\omega < -1$
III	$3\xi_1 H\rho_{DM}$	$\omega < -1$

In this framework, the Friedmann equations can be written as

$$H^2(z) = \frac{8\pi G}{3}\left[\rho_{DE}(z) + \rho_{DM}(z) + \rho_b(z)\right]\,, \tag{2}$$

$$\dot{H} = -\frac{4\pi G}{H}\left[\rho_{DM}(z) + \rho_b(z) + (1+\omega_{DE})\rho_{DE}(z)\right]\,, \tag{3}$$

where we are considering a universe composed of only dark energy, dark matter, and baryons (ρ_b). We will use this to construct the Hubble parameter for each of the interacting models and compare it with the Hubble parameter inferred from the BOSS quasar data in the next subsection.

For Models I and II, the energy densities for dark energy and dark matter behave as [12]

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{DE} &= (1+z)^{3(1+\omega_{DE}+\xi_2)}\rho^0_{DE}\,, \\ \rho_{DM} &= (1+z)^3 \\ &\quad\times\left\{\frac{\xi_2\left[1-(1+z)^{3(\xi_2+\omega_{DE})}\right]\rho^0_{DE}}{\xi_2+\omega_{DE}} + \rho^0_{DM}\right\}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where the superscript 0 indicates quantities measured today. The baryonic density is given by the standard ex-

pression, proportional to $(1+z)^3$. For Model III, the evolution of the energy densities is given by [12]

$$\rho_{DE} = (1+z)^{3(1+\omega_{DE})}\left(\rho^0_{DE} + \frac{\xi_1\rho^0_{DM}}{\xi_1+\omega_{DE}}\right) - \frac{\xi_1}{\xi_1+\omega_{DE}}(1+z)^{3(1-\xi_1)}\rho^0_{DM}\,,$$
$$\rho_{DM} = \rho^0_{DM}(1+z)^{3-3\xi_1}\,. \quad (5)$$

One can see from these equations that if there is an energy flow from dark energy to dark matter (i.e., if the coupling constant is positive), then the energy density for dark matter is always smaller than what one would expect in the standard ΛCDM model. Since ρ_{DM} is the dominant contribution in the Friedmann equations at higher redshifts and since observations indicate that the universe is well explained by the ΛCDM model at low redshifts, which means that $\omega^0_{DE} \approx -1$ (e.g. [1]), one can see from Eq. (3) that the interaction implies a smaller Hubble parameter in the past in comparison with ΛCDM, when H_0 is held fixed and for a positive coupling constant.

Furthermore, this helps alleviating the coincidence problem which is the fact that we do not understand why the energy densities of dark energy and dark matter are so close today. As it can be seen in [24], a positive coupling constant implies that the quantity $r \equiv \rho_{DM}/\rho_{DE}$ decreases at a slower rate in the interacting model than in the ΛCDM model. This makes the energy density of dark energy closer to the one of dark matter in the past, giving us a better understanding of their closer values today.

B. The Hubble Parameter of the Interacting Theory at $z = 2.34$

In order to gain some intuition before performing the proper statistical analysis, let us see whether the measured value of the Hubble parameter by the BOSS collaboration, $H(2.34) = 222 \pm 7$ km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1}, can be accommodated by the phenomenological interacting models introduced above. From this perspective, we compare the Hubble parameter constructed theoretically with its observational value at $z = 2.34$.

In order to compute the value of the Hubble parameter from Eqs. (2), (4), and (5), one needs several cosmological parameters such as H_0, Ω^0_{DE}, Ω^0_{DM}, and Ω^0_b. The standard ΛCDM parameters found from the *Planck* analysis were used by the BOSS collaboration (listed in Table II). We first use these parameters to construct $H(z)$, and we show the resulting Hubble parameter at $z = 2.34$ with respect to the coupling constant ξ in the left panel of Fig. 1. Alternatively, in the right panel of Fig. 1, we use the adjusted cosmological parameters found in [22] from the analysis of the interacting model using *Planck*, BAO, SnIa, and H_0 data. The goal of using different sets of cosmological parameters is to see if the parameters adjusted to the interacting models yield a different prediction than the parameters adjusted to ΛCDM.

TABLE II: Cosmological parameters used by the BOSS collaboration [3].

Parameter	Bestfit	σ
h	0.706	0.032
$\Omega^0_{DM}h^2$	0.143	0.003
Ω^0_{DE}	0.714	0.020
$\Omega^0_b h^2$	0.02207	0.00033

As we can see in Fig. 1, the curves are in accordance with the Hubble parameter inferred by BOSS (indicated by the dashed gray line and by the 1σ and 2σ shaded areas) given a nonzero coupling constant. Comparing the left and right panels for Model I (red curve), we notice that different cosmological parameters require a different sign for the coupling constant ξ in order to match the BOSS result. This indicates that Model I may not be fully robust at explaining the observed value of $H(z = 2.34)$ from BOSS. For Models II and III (the purple and blue curves, respectively), we see that the theory can easily be within the 1σ shaded area for a positive coupling constant in both panels. We notice that in order for the theoretical value of $H(2.34)$ to match the BOSS measurement, the values of the coupling constant have to be higher in the right panel where the cosmological parameters were adjusted to *Planck*+BAO+SnIa+H_0 data using the interacting model.

At this point, Fig. 1 provides us with indications that a positive coupling constant allows one to explain in a very simple way a smaller value of the Hubble parameter in the past, which is not possible with ΛCDM or dynamical dark energy, and without requiring a very exotic dark energy component. The fact that we obtain a positive coupling constant is crucial, because only positive values help alleviating the coincidence problem. Thus, this model gives a natural explanation for the energy densities of the dark components at low redshifts and also at high redshifts since they may explain the BOSS data.

This gives us evidence that the interacting dark energy model has the required features to be able to explain the different cosmological evolution shown by the BOSS collaboration at higher redshifts. However, this difference from ΛCDM dynamics is also encoded in the angular distances, as inferred by the BAO measurement. We now compare the results for these parameters by performing a global fit analysis of the interacting model with the currently available data.

III. ANALYSIS

A. Methodology

Now that we see some evidence that the interacting dark energy model can explain the deviation from ΛCDM



FIG. 1: We plot $H(z = 2.34)$ as a function of the coupling ξ (corresponding to ξ_2 for Model I and II and to ξ_1 for Model III). The left panel represents the Hubble parameter calculated using the cosmological parameters from Table II. The right panel represents $H(2.34)$ using the parameters found in [22] (see Table X for Model I, Table XI for Model II, and Table XII for Model III) obtained from *Planck*+BAO+SnIa+H_0. The dashed gray line is the BOSS measured value of $H(2.34) = 222 \pm 7$ km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1}, and the shaded areas represent 1σ and 2σ deviations from this average.

observed by BOSS, we perform a Bayesian statistical analysis of the interacting dark energy model with the *Planck* and BOSS Lyα quasar data. We wish to compare the interacting dark energy model presented here against ΛCDM and test the predictions of the interacting dark energy model with the addition of the new BOSS data. In order to achieve this, we perform a global fit by running the CosmoMC package [25], a publicly available code that performs a Monte Carlo Markov Chain (MCMC) parameter sampling. To include the interaction between dark energy and dark matter, we modify the Boltzmann code CAMB [26] by adding the coupling constant ξ_2 for Model II and ξ_1 for Model III and by adding the constant EoS of dark energy to the baseline ΛCDM parameters used by *Planck* [1]. From now on, we will omit Model I from the analysis since this model showed us not to be a very good model to explain the new BOSS data. Also, this model does not help alleviating the coincidence problem. Model I will be explored in more detail in a follow-up paper [27].

Since we wish to compare the results of our global fit with the ones obtained by the BOSS collaboration, we first reproduce the analysis done by the BOSS team using the publicly available BOSS quasar Lyα forest data alone for the autocorrelation [3] and cross-correlation of quasars with the Lyα absorption forest [28]. We use the DR11 catalog from the BOSS experiment of SDSS which contains 158,401 quasars in the redshift range $2.1 \leq z \leq 3.5$. This analysis can be made by using the *baofit* software[1] provided by the BOSS collaboration. With this analysis, we generated the constraints for $D_A(z = 2.34)/r_d \times D_H(z = 2.34)/r_d$ shown in Fig. 2 in pink for the cross-correlation and in blue for the autocorrelation. As stated in [3], this result is weakly dependent on the cosmological model adopted although the observed peak position and cosmological parameters were only determined using the ΛCDM correlation functions generated by CAMB.

For our global fit of the interacting dark energy model, we used the *Planck* 2013 *TT* power spectrum both in the low-ℓ ($2 \leq \ell < 50$) and high-ℓ ($50 \leq \ell \leq 2500$) regimes. Together with the *Planck* data, we include the polarization measurements from the nine year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) [29], the low-ℓ ($\ell < 32$) *TE*, *EE*, and *BB* likelihoods. We also included in the CosmoMC analysis the BOSS quasar Lyα forest data at $z = 2.34$ corresponding to two set of points, $(D_A(z = 2.34)/r_d, D_H(z = 2.34)/r_d)$, for the autocorrelation and cross-correlation. We used flat prior within the *Planck* 2013 ranges for all the "vanilla" ΛCDM parameters [1]. The coupling constants and dark energy EoS also received flat priors with $\xi_2 \in [0, 0.4[$ for Model II, $\xi_1 \in [0, 0.01]$ for Model III, and $\omega \in [-2.5, -1.001]$ for both models. The coupling constants are expected to be small from the previous analysis of [22].

B. Results

We wish to compare the constraints in $D_A(z = 2.34)/r_d \times D_H(z = 2.34)/r_d$ found by the BOSS collaboration with the global fits of the interacting dark energy model and of ΛCDM. We present these results in Fig. 2.

First, we perform a global fit of ΛCDM and of the interacting dark energy models considering only the BOSS quasar Lyα data in order to check the consistency of our analysis. The BOSS collaboration obtained[2] $D_H/r_d = 9.18 \pm 0.28(1\sigma) \pm 0.6(2\sigma)$ and $D_A/r_d =$

[1] Available at http://github.com/deepzot/baofit/.

[2] We drop the argument $z = 2.34$ from here on, but it is implicitly



FIG. 2: Plot of the 68.3% and 95.5% likelihood contours in $D_A(z=2.34)/r_d \times D_H(z=2.34)/r_d$ comparing the BOSS autocorrelation (blue) and cross-correlation (pink) with the results for the theoretical models (green for ΛCDM, purple for the interacting Model II, and gray for the interacting Model III) using *Planck* data (dotted line contours) and *Planck*+BOSS data (full line and shaded contours). The dashed dark green contours represent our MCMC analysis of BOSS data alone adjusted for ΛCDM.

$11.28 \pm 0.65(1\sigma)^{+2.8}_{-1.2}(2\sigma)$. The constraints that we find for ΛCDM (shown by the dashed dark green contours in Fig. 2) are not very strong, but they are compatible with the contours found by the BOSS collaboration (shown in blue and pink) as they almost completely overlap. The same result is found for the interacting models (not shown in Fig. 2 since it does not carry any additional information).

Having confirmed that our analysis is consistent, we perform the analysis using only *Planck* data for the ΛCDM and interacting dark energy models. The constraints are shown by the dotted line contours in Fig. 2. We can see that for ΛCDM (dotted green lines) we obtain more or less the same result as [3] with $D_H/r_d = 8.571^{0.26}_{0.27}$ and $D_A/r_d = 11.752^{0.74}_{0.75}$. This confirms that ΛCDM differs from the BOSS result by at least $\sim 1.5\sigma$. When we test the interacting models (dotted purple and gray lines), this difference is reduced, and we can see that the contours overlap with the 1σ region of the BOSS autocorrelation data. Model II, for which we find[3] $D_H/r_d = 8.72(8.73)^{0.09}_{0.05}$ and $D_A/r_d = 11.69(11.63) \pm 0.08$, shows the biggest overlap with the BOSS results. The very elongated contours of Model III imply that this conclusion is less strong in this case.

We then include the BOSS quasar Lyα data together with the *Planck* data and repeat the above analysis. As a result, the ΛCDM contours (shaded green areas) are almost unchanged. Our interpretation is that ΛCDM is not sensible to the inclusion of this data set (BOSS quasar Lyα data), and therefore, it cannot accommodate the change in the Hubble parameter at high redshift. On the other hand, the interacting Models II and III (purple and gray shaded areas) significantly change with the inclusion of the BOSS data set. First, we note that the contours become more constrained, especially in the case of Model III. Also, both models are slightly shifted towards higher D_H/r_d and smaller D_A/r_d. Specifically, we find $D_H/r_d = 8.76(8.79)^{0.06}_{0.04}$ and $D_A/r_d = 11.66(11.67) \pm 0.08$ for Model II and $D_H(z=2.34)/r_d = 8.70(8.71) \pm 0.03$ and $D_A(z=2.34)/r_d = 11.79(11.82)^{0.10}_{0.15}$ for Model III. This improves the overlap between the 1σ regions of the BOSS autocorrelation and the interacting models. Model II shows the best concordance of all.

In performing the MCMC analysis of the interacting models, we also obtained the adjusted values of the coupling constants. As was shown in [22], using only the *Planck* data is not sufficient to fully constrain the coupling constants. We note that we obtained the same result here, even with the inclusion of the BOSS quasar data: we find $\xi_2 < 0.045\,(0.048)$ for Model II and $\xi_1 < 0.0016\,(0.0015)$ for Model III. The upper bound on the coupling constant for Model II is close to the ones predicted in Section II-B (see Fig. 1). Indeed, the

assumed.

[3] Bestfit values are presented inside brackets.



FIG. 3: Contour plot of the EoS for dark energy (ω) versus the coupling constant between dark energy and dark matter (ξ). In purple, we present the interacting Model II, and in gray, the interacting Model III. The dotted line contours show the models fitted to the *Planck* data only, and the full line and shaded contours show the models fitted to *Planck*+BOSS data. The cosmological constant Λ of ΛCDM corresponds to $\omega = -1$, and it is depicted by the dashed black horizontal line.

corresponding Hubble parameter for Model II that results from the MCMC analysis is $H(2.34) = 232(231) \pm 2\,\mathrm{km/s/Mpc}$, which is $\sim 1\sigma$ away from the BOSS result[4], hence resulting in a much reduced tension compared to ΛCDM. This indicates that the interacting Model II is a good candidate to explain the observed deviation from ΛCDM from high-z BAO probes. The upper bound on the coupling constant for Model III is much smaller than expected from Fig. 1. Still, it represents an improvement over ΛCDM in explaining the BOSS results as seen from Fig. 2, although to a smaller extent than Model II.

The upper bounds found for the coupling constants are compatible with small positive values. Although we cannot exclude the possibility that the coupling constants are zero with the data set used, we can see from the constraints obtained for the EoS of dark energy that our models are not consistent with ΛCDM. The EoS for dark energy obtained in the MCMC analysis are the following: considering only *Planck* data, $\omega = -1.51(-1.55)^{+0.32}_{-0.30}$ for Model II and $\omega = -1.75(-1.668)^{+0.46}_{-0.29}$ for Model III; considering *Planck*+BOSS data, $\omega = -1.63(-1.79)^{+0.18}_{-0.28}$ for Model II and $\omega = -1.76(-1.99)^{+0.26}_{-0.28}$ for Model III. We can also see the constraints in the $\omega \times \xi$ plot, presented in Fig. 3, where we follow the same style and color schemes as in Fig. 2. The dashed black horizontal line represents the value of the dark energy EoS for ΛCDM, $\omega = -1$. Although we have a large degeneracy between ω and ξ, we can see from this plot that, except for Model II with only the *Planck* data, the models are not compatible with $\omega = -1$ at $\gtrsim 96\%$ confidence level.

A more detailed analysis will be presented in a follow-up paper [27] where we will combine this analysis with different cosmological probes, aiming at fully constraining the coupling constant of the interacting models.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we explored the consequences of interacting dark energy in light of the recent results by the BOSS experiment. The BOSS data indicates that the Hubble parameter at $z = 2.34$ is smaller than what one would expect from the standard ΛCDM model, something that cannot be explained by simple dynamical dark energy models such as quintessence. Our results suggest that interacting dark energy can naturally explain the BOSS data without introducing exotic forms of dark energy.

We tested three different phenomenological models of interacting dark energy. First, we computed the theoretical value of the Hubble parameter at $z = 2.34$ for different sets of cosmological parameters. Models II and III showed to be in good agreement with the observations for a small positive coupling constant. Furthermore, such a positive coupling constant can help alleviating the coincidence problem. Model I was omitted from the analysis since it did not contribute to reducing the tension with the BOSS data, and also, in general, it does not help relieving the coincidence problem.

We then performed a global fit of those models given the *Planck* 2013 and BOSS quasar Lyα data. This showed that Models II and III are compatible with the BOSS collaboration results at a good confidence level, reducing the discrepancy coming from ΛCDM. Model II appeared as the most promising theory, presenting a small positive coupling constant. Also, we could see from the EoS obtained that those models are different than ΛCDM at high confidence level (*Planck*+BOSS). These results suggest that the interacting dark energy models presented in this paper can be used to explain the deviations from ΛCDM found in high-z BAO, and they represent a simpler solution than invoking exotic dark energy models.

In order to further constrain interacting dark energy models, one could refine the analysis of this work by using more data sets and by combining the BOSS data with other observations. A more detailed analysis of the global

[4] We would like to stress that $H(z)$ is a model-dependent quantity, while D_H/r_d is not. It is in this context that we compare our results with BOSS. However, since we find that the fitted values for r_d are approximately equal to what one expects in ΛCDM (given the use of the *Planck* data), we can still compare the Hubble parameter values for the interacting models with the BOSS result.

fit of those models with the inclusion of BOSS data is the topic of a follow-up paper that is currently in preparation. Furthermore, the JPAS telescope [30] will be able to reproduce and improve the BAO measurements at high redshifts since this instrument is supposed to be optimized to measure quasars at high redshifts compared to previous experiments [31].

Acknowledgments

E. F. and E. A. acknowledge financial support from CNPq (Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico) and from FAPESP (Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo). J. Q. acknowledges the Fonds de recherche du Québec - Nature et technologies (FRQNT) and the Walter C. Sumner Foundation for financial support. A. C. thanks FAPESP and CAPES for the financial support under grant number 2013/26496-2 (FAPESP). B. W. is supported by the National Basic Research Program of China (973 Program 2013CB834900) and by the National Natural Science Foundation of China. This work has made use of the computing facilities of the Laboratory of Astroinformatics (IAG/USP, NAT/Unicsul), whose purchase was made possible by the Brazilian agency FAPESP (2009/54006-4) and the INCT-A. Computations were also made in part on the supercomputer Guillimin from McGill University, managed by Calcul Québec and Compute Canada. The operation of this supercomputer is funded by the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI), NanoQuébec, RMGA, and FRQNT.

[1] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], "Planck 2013 results. XVI. Cosmological parameters," Astron. Astrophys. **571**, A16 (2014) doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201321591 [arXiv:1303.5076 [astro-ph.CO]].

[2] P. Bull *et al.*, "Beyond ΛCDM: Problems, solutions, and the road ahead," arXiv:1512.05356 [astro-ph.CO].

[3] T. Delubac *et al.* [BOSS Collaboration], "Baryon acoustic oscillations in the Lyα forest of BOSS DR11 quasars," Astron. Astrophys. **574**, A59 (2015) doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201423969 [arXiv:1404.1801 [astro-ph.CO]].

[4] E. J. Copeland, M. Sami and S. Tsujikawa, "Dynamics of dark energy," Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **15**, 1753 (2006) doi:10.1142/S021827180600942X [hep-th/0603057].

[5] T. Damour, G. W. Gibbons and C. Gundlach, "Dark Matter, Time Varying G, and a Dilaton Field," Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 123 (1990). doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.64.123

[6] S. Micheletti, E. Abdalla and B. Wang, "A Field Theory Model for Dark Matter and Dark Energy in Interaction," Phys. Rev. D **79**, 123506 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.123506 [arXiv:0902.0318 [gr-qc]].

[7] S. M. R. Micheletti, "Observational constraints on holographic tachyonic dark energy in interaction with dark matter," JCAP **1005**, 009 (2010) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2010/05/009 [arXiv:0912.3992 [gr-qc]].

[8] K. Koyama, R. Maartens and Y. S. Song, "Velocities as a probe of dark sector interactions," JCAP **0910**, 017 (2009) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2009/10/017 [arXiv:0907.2126 [astro-ph.CO]].

[9] L. Amendola, "Coupled quintessence," Phys. Rev. D **62**, 043511 (2000) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.62.043511 [astro-ph/9908023].

[10] B. Wang, Y. g. Gong and E. Abdalla, "Transition of the dark energy equation of state in an interacting holographic dark energy model," Phys. Lett. B **624**, 141 (2005) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2005.08.008 [hep-th/0506069].

[11] J. H. He, B. Wang and E. Abdalla, "Stability of the curvature perturbation in dark sectors' mutual interacting models," Phys. Lett. B **671**, 139 (2009) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2008.11.062 [arXiv:0807.3471 [gr-qc]].

[12] J. H. He and B. Wang, "Effects of the interaction between dark energy and dark matter on cosmological parameters," JCAP **0806**, 010 (2008) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2008/06/010 [arXiv:0801.4233 [astro-ph]].

[13] J. H. He, B. Wang and E. Abdalla, "Testing the interaction between dark energy and dark matter via latest observations," Phys. Rev. D **83**, 063515 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.83.063515 [arXiv:1012.3904 [astro-ph.CO]].

[14] A. B. Pavan, E. G. M. Ferreira, S. Micheletti, J. C. C. de Souza and E. Abdalla, "Exact cosmological solutions of models with an interacting dark sector," Phys. Rev. D **86**, 103521 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.103521 [arXiv:1111.6526 [gr-qc]].

[15] E. Abdalla, L. L. Graef and B. Wang, "A Model for Dark Energy decay," Phys. Lett. B **726**, 786 (2013) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2013.08.011 [arXiv:1202.0499 [gr-qc]].

[16] A. A. Costa, L. C. Olivari and E. Abdalla, "Quintessence with Yukawa Interaction," Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 10, 103501 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.103501 [arXiv:1411.3660 [astro-ph.CO]].

[17] V. Faraoni, J. B. Dent and E. N. Saridakis, "Covariantizing the interaction between dark energy and dark matter," Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 6, 063510 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.063510 [arXiv:1405.7288 [gr-qc]].

[18] V. Salvatelli, N. Said, M. Bruni, A. Melchiorri and D. Wands, "Indications of a late-time interaction in the dark sector," Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, no. 18, 181301 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.181301 [arXiv:1406.7297 [astro-ph.CO]].

[19] É. Aubourg *et al.*, "Cosmological implications of baryon acoustic oscillation measurements," Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 12, 123516 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.123516 [arXiv:1411.1074 [astro-ph.CO]].

[20] V. H. Cardenas, "Exploring hints for dark energy density evolution in light of recent data," Phys. Lett. B **750**, 128 (2015) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2015.08.064 [arXiv:1405.5116 [astro-ph.CO]].

[21] V. Sahni, A. Shafieloo and A. A. Starobinsky, "Model

independent evidence for dark energy evolution from Baryon Acoustic Oscillations," Astrophys. J. **793**, no. 2, L40 (2014) doi:10.1088/2041-8205/793/2/L40 [arXiv:1406.2209 [astro-ph.CO]].

[22] A. A. Costa, X. D. Xu, B. Wang, E. G. M. Ferreira and E. Abdalla, "Testing the Interaction between Dark Energy and Dark Matter with Planck Data," Phys. Rev. D **89**, no. 10, 103531 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.103531 [arXiv:1311.7380 [astro-ph.CO]].

[23] C. Feng, B. Wang, E. Abdalla and R. K. Su, "Observational constraints on the dark energy and dark matter mutual coupling," Phys. Lett. B **665**, 111 (2008) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2008.05.066 [arXiv:0804.0110 [astro-ph]].

[24] P. C. Ferreira, D. Pavón and J. C. Carvalho, "On detecting interactions in the dark sector with H(z) data," Phys. Rev. D **88**, 083503 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.083503 [arXiv:1310.2160 [gr-qc]].

[25] A. Lewis and S. Bridle, "Cosmological parameters from CMB and other data: A Monte Carlo approach," Phys. Rev. D **66**, 103511 (2002) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.66.103511 [astro-ph/0205436].

[26] A. Lewis, A. Challinor and A. Lasenby, "Efficient computation of CMB anisotropies in closed FRW models," Astrophys. J. **538**, 473 (2000) doi:10.1086/309179 [astro-ph/9911177].

[27] E. Abdalla, A. A. Costa, E. G. M. Ferreira, J. Quintin and B. Wang, in preparation.

[28] A. Font-Ribera *et al.* [BOSS Collaboration], "Quasar-Lyman α Forest Cross-Correlation from BOSS DR11 : Baryon Acoustic Oscillations," JCAP **1405**, 027 (2014) doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2014/05/027 [arXiv:1311.1767 [astro-ph.CO]].

[29] C. L. Bennett *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], "Nine-Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Final Maps and Results," Astrophys. J. Suppl. **208**, 20 (2013) doi:10.1088/0067-0049/208/2/20 [arXiv:1212.5225 [astro-ph.CO]].

[30] N. Benitez *et al.* [J-PAS Collaboration], "J-PAS: The Javalambre-Physics of the Accelerated Universe Astrophysical Survey," arXiv:1403.5237 [astro-ph.CO].

[31] L. R. Abramo *et al.*, "Measuring large-scale structure with quasars in narrow-band filter surveys," Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **423**, no. 4, 3251 (2012) doi:10.1111/j.1365-2966.2012.21115.x [arXiv:1108.2657 [astro-ph.CO]].